RSD 17
# Evaluation and Professional Learning System (2015-2016)

RSD 17 Mission Statement

The Mission of Regional School District 17 is to engage students in an educational community that challenges them with high standards and builds their capacity for success and their aspiration to improve themselves and their society

Table of Contents

TEACHER EVALUATION AND PROFESSIONAL LEARNING SYSTEM

Introduction

Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System

The Regional School District 17 Evaluation and Professional Learning System is based on the District's commitment to the continuous improvement process (CIP) in professional practice and student achievement. This system supports the district CIP by identifying clear standards of professional practice, supporting opportunities for professional development, reflection, explicit feedback and developing a process for measuring student growth and achievement. Collaboration between teachers and administrators is an essential and embedded part of this system and reflects our belief that collaborative professional learning is critical to assuring student success and achievement.

Core Design Principles

The following principles guided the design of the evaluation system

- *Consider multiple, standards-based measures of performance*
  An evaluation system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in a fair, accurate and comprehensive picture of a teacher's performance. The new model defines four categories of teacher effectiveness: student learning (45%), teacher performance and practice (40%), parent feedback (10%) and school-wide student learning or student feedback (5%). These categories are grounded in research-based, national standards: the Common Core State Standards, as well as Connecticut's standards: The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT); the Connecticut Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; Connecticut State Assessments; and locally-developed curriculum standards.

- *Promote both professional judgment and consistency*
  Assessing a teacher's professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No rubric or formula, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how teachers interact with students, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into performance ratings is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. At the same time, teachers' ratings should reflect their performance, not their evaluators' biases. Accordingly, the model aims to minimize the variance between school leaders' evaluations of classroom practice and support fairness and consistency within and across schools.

- *Foster dialogue about student learning*
  This model hinges on improving the professional conversation between and among teachers and administrators who are their evaluators. The dialogue in the new model

occurs more frequently and focuses on what students are learning and what teachers and their administrators can do to support teaching and learning.

- *Encourage aligned professional development, coaching and feedback to support teacher growth*
  Novice and veteran teachers alike deserve detailed, constructive feedback and professional development tailored to the individual needs of their classrooms and students. This system promotes a shared language of excellence to which professional development, coaching and feedback can align to improve practice.

- *Ensure feasibility of implementation*
  Launching this model will require hard work. Throughout the district, educators will need to develop new skills and to think differently about how they manage and prioritize their time and resources.

TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Evaluation and Support System Overview

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All teachers will be evaluated in four categories, grouped in two major focus areas: Teacher Practice and Student Outcomes.

Teacher Practice Related Indicators: An evaluation of the core instructional practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This focus area is comprised of two categories:

(a) **Observation of teacher performance and practice (40%)** as defined in the Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014, which articulates four domains with 12 attributes of effective teacher practice
(b) **Parent feedback (10%)** on teacher practice through surveys and/or other sources of data.

Student Outcomes Related Indicators: An evaluation of teachers' contribution to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. There is also an option in this focus area to include student feedback. This focus area is comprised of two categories:

(a) **Student growth and development (45%)** as determined by the teacher's student learning objective (SLO)
(b) **Whole-school measures of student learning** as determined by aggregate student learning indicators or **student feedback (5%)** through student surveys and/or other sources of data.

Scores from each of the four categories will be combined to produce a summative performance rating of *exemplary, proficient, developing* or *below standard*. The performance levels are defined as:

Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

Proficient – Meeting indicators of performance

Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

Below Standard – Not meeting indicators of performance

The RSD17 Evaluation sub-committee would like to note that proficient is defined as "well advanced in an art, occupation, or branch of knowledge" and exemplary is "deserving imitation" and "commendable" according to the Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary www.m-w.com.

Teacher Evaluation Process and Timeline

The annual evaluation process between a teacher and an evaluator (principal or designee) is anchored by three performance conversations at the beginning, middle and end of the year. The purpose of these conversations is to clarify expectations for the evaluation process, provide comprehensive feedback to each teacher on his/her performance, set developmental goals and identify developmental opportunities. These conversations are collaborative and require reflection and preparation by both the evaluator and the teacher in order to be productive and meaningful.

Goal Setting & Planning	Mid-Year Check-in	End-of-Year Review
• Orientation on process • Teacher reflection and goal setting • Goal-setting conference	• Review goals and performance to date • Mid-year conferences	• Teacher self-assessment • Scoring • End-of-year conference
By November 15	January/February	Last Day of School

Goal-Setting and Planning:
    Timeframe: Target is October 15; must be completed by **November 15**

1. *Orientation on Process* – To begin the evaluation process, evaluators meet with teachers, in a group or individually, to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will discuss any school or district priorities that could be reflected in teacher practice goals and the student learning objective (SLO), and they will commit to set time aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation process.

2. *Teacher Reflection and Goal-Setting* – The teacher examines student data, prior year evaluation and survey results and the Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 to draft a proposed performance and practice goal parent feedback goal, a student learning objective (SLO), and a student feedback goal (if required) for the school year. The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process. **Appendix H or I**

3. G*oal-Setting Conference* – The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss the teacher's proposed goals and objectives in order to arrive at mutual agreement about them. The teacher and the evaluator collect evidence about the teacher's practice to support the proposed goals. The evaluator may request revisions or additions to the proposed goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria. If any of the goals are not mutually agreed upon then the teacher will initiate the dispute resolution process. **Appendix B Appendix K**

Mid-Year Check-In:
Timeframe: **January and February**

1. *Reflection and Preparation* – The teacher and evaluator collect and reflect on evidence to date about the teacher's practice and student learning in preparation for the check-in.

2. *Mid-Year Conference* – The evaluator and teacher complete at least one mid-year check-in conference during which they review progress on teacher practice goals, the student learning objective (SLO) and performance on each to date. The mid-year conference is an important point in the year for addressing concerns and reviewing results for the first half of the year. Evaluators can deliver mid-year formative information on components of the evaluation framework for which evidence has been gathered and analyzed. If needed, teachers and evaluators can mutually agree to revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustment of the SLO to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). They also discuss actions that the teacher can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote teacher growth in his/her development areas. **Appendix C**

End-of-Year Summative Review:

Timeframe:
- For teachers in years one and two:
  o **Must** be completed by the **second week** in April.

- For teachers in the evaluation cycle:
  o May be scheduled for completion in March or April.
  o *Recommended* to be scheduled for completion in May or early June.
  o **Must** be completed by the **last day of school.**

1. *Teacher Reflection and Evidence and Self-Assessment*– The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year in the reflection and evidence portion of the Professional Growth and Goals Evaluation Form and self-assesses growth (provide a self-assessment rating) in each goal area. This reflection and self-assessment should focus specifically on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference. **Appendix H or I**

2. *Scoring* – The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments and observation data to generate category and focus area ratings. The category ratings generate the final, summative rating which will be determined by the dates outlined above. After all data, (including standardized test data, if applicable), are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating if the test data change the student-related indicators significantly enough to change the final rating. Such revisions should take place as soon as test data are available and before September 15th of the following school year. **Appendix H or I**

3. *End-of-Year Conference* – The evaluator and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss category ratings. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and completes the Professional Growth and Evaluation Form per the dates outlined above. **Appendix C, H or I**

4. The evaluator signs the document and the teacher signs the document to acknowledge that the evaluation conference occurred and to acknowledge receipt of the completed Professional Growth and Evaluation Form.

Primary and Complementary Evaluators

The primary evaluator for most teachers will be the school principal or assistant principal, who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, including assigning summative ratings. Administrators not assigned to specific buildings may be used at times as complementary evaluators. These evaluators may be used to collect evaluation information and provide feedback on any of the domains of teacher practice.

Primary evaluators will have sole responsibility for assigning final summative ratings. Primary and complementary evaluators must achieve proficiency on the evaluation training modules provided.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators, both primary and complementary are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will provide the district with training opportunities and tools throughout the year to support district administrators and evaluators in implementing the system across their schools. The District will adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to their schools and to ensure that evaluators are proficient in conducting teacher evaluations.

The CSDE will select districts at random annually to review evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated *exemplary* and two educators rated *below standard*.

SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

Evaluation alone cannot hope to improve teaching practice and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant and timely support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move teachers along the path to exemplary practice.

Evaluation-Based Professional Learning

In any sector, people learn and grow by honestly co-assessing current performance, setting clear goals for future performance, and outlining the supports they need to close the gap. Throughout the RSD 17 Evaluation process, every teacher will be identifying their professional learning needs in mutual agreement between the teacher and his/her evaluator and serves as the foundation for ongoing conversations about the teacher's practice and impact on student outcomes. The professional learning opportunities identified for each teacher should be based on the individual strengths and needs that are identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common need among teachers, which can then be targeted with school-wide professional development opportunities.

Regional School District 17 Vision for Professional Learning

Student success depends on effective teaching and leadership. Regional School District 17's vision for professional learning is that each educator engages in continuous learning every day to increase professional effectiveness, resulting in positive outcomes for each and every student. For our students to graduate ready for college and careers, educators must engage in strategically-planned, well-supported, standards-based, continuous professional learning focused on student growth and development.

High-quality professional learning is a process that ensures all educators have equitable access, throughout their career continuum, to relevant individual and collaborative opportunities to enhance their practice so that all students advance towards positive academic and non-academic outcomes.

Professional learning is further defined as intensive and sustained continuous improvement for educators that is aligned to standards, is conducted among educators, occurs frequently, and includes a repository of best practices for teaching methods developed by educators. Professional learning programs should reflect a comprehensive approach to increasing teacher and administrator effectiveness, focused on improving teaching methods, and a shared collective responsibility for student growth.

Values and Beliefs

An effective professional learning system:

- is fundamental to both educator and student growth;
- supports the developmental process for educator growth in knowledge and skills;
- provides each educator access to ongoing opportunities to engage in continuous, career-long learning to refine, improve and enhance practice;
- includes relevant job-embedded learning that requires dedicated and sustained time;

- supports individual educator, team, school, district and state improvement goals aligned to a vision for teaching and learning;
- promotes educator collaboration around relevant, meaningful goals that align to and support an overall shared district vision for teaching and learning;
- encourages all members of the learning community to build and cultivate collective responsibility, continuous improvement, and shared leadership toward effective professional learning experiences.

Regional School District 17 Standards for Professional Learning

Regional School District 17 Standards for Professional Learning are adapted from the *Connecticut Standards for Professional Learning* (in development), which are directly tied to the research behind the Standards for Professional Learning developed by the national *Learning Forward* organization.

Regional School District 17 Standards for Professional Learning are important to the design, implementation and sustainability of our professional learning system. They define the characteristics of a high-quality system of professional learning and will be used by our district Professional Learning Committee, district and/or school administrators, and teachers to ensure high-quality professional learning.

Professional learning that enhances both educator practice and outcomes for each student…

- occurs within **learning communities** committed to continuous growth, collective responsibility, family and community engagement and alignment of district and school vision and goals.
- requires and develops **leadership capacity** at all levels to advocate for and create systems for professional learning.
- entails purposeful planning for the identification, coordination, monitoring, evaluation, and equitable use and allocation of **resources** to support educator learning.
- compiles both quantitative and qualitative student data from educator and system **assessments** to plan, implement, monitor professional learning.
- integrates research on effective adult learning and uses flexible **learning designs** to achieve intended outcomes.
- applies change research and uses tools to identify and support the developmental stages of change and ensures the **fidelity of implementation**.
- is **aligned** with district/school goals, relevant Connecticut standards, and other agreed-upon standards for educator practice and student growth.

Regional School District 17 Professional Learning Committee

The RSD 17 Professional Learning Committee is a subcommittee of the district Evaluation and Professional Development Committee and is composed of certified teachers, administrators and other appropriate school personnel including representatives selected by the respective bargaining units. Members of the committee collaboratively define a shared vision and share responsibility for the development, evaluation and updating of a comprehensive professional learning plan and participate

in the development or adoption of the district educator evaluation and support program. The committee designs and regularly updates a comprehensive plan that guides how professional learning is developed, implemented, monitored and evaluated within a district. The actions of the professional learning committee specifically include:

- Participation in the development of the annual district-wide professional development plan informed by conducting periodic needs-assessments processes with stakeholders.
- Monitoring and evaluating the implementation and effectiveness of professional development via periodic surveying of stakeholders and via quarterly district committee meetings.

Assistance Plans

If a teacher's performance is rated as *developing* or *below standard*, it signals the need for an individualized assistance plan to improve and remediate the teacher's performance. The plan should target the specific areas where the teacher demonstrated deficiencies in the course of the evaluation process. The evaluator may initiate an assistance plan at any point in the school year if he or she feels the teacher's performance is at risk of receiving a *developing* or *below standard* rating based on evidence gathered through the evaluation process. Assistance plans are meant to support and assist a teacher and/or to remediate areas of concern as soon as possible and do not require the teacher to have received a summative rating of *developing* or *below standard* before it begins.

There are two levels of Assistance Plans: the Improvement Plan and the Remediation Plan.

Improvement Plan

When a teacher is demonstrating a pattern of unsatisfactory performance consistent with a rating of *developing* or *below standard*, the evaluator must meet with the teacher and his/her bargaining unit representative to communicate this information.

During the meeting with the teacher and bargaining unit representative, the evaluator describes specific areas of concern about the teacher's performance and provides detailed evidence of the teacher's unsatisfactory performance as documented through classroom observations and other sources of evidence. A collaborative plan for additional supervision and support to remediate those areas of concern is developed by the evaluator, bargaining unit representative and the teacher. (**Appendix J**) The plan must include:

- formal and informal observations focused on the documented deficiencies;
- resources, support and other strategies to address documented deficiencies;
- a timeline for implementing such observations, resources, support and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued; and
- indicators of success including a summative rating of *proficient* or better at the conclusion of the Improvement Plan.

The evaluator must inform the teacher that failure to remedy the areas that are unsatisfactory within a period no longer than 45 school days will result in the placement of the teacher into a Remediation Plan. The length of the plan can reasonably be adjusted to provide adequate evidence upon mutual agreement. Complete documentation of all classroom observations, recommendations for improvement and conferences with the teacher are essential, and all parties involved including the

teacher, the evaluator and the collective bargaining unit representative must have copies of all documentation. The evaluator will submit a summary report of teacher performance within 5 school days after the completion of the Improvement Plan with a statement of successful c o m p l e t i o n of the plan or a recommendation to move to the Remediation Plan.

Remediation Plan

If a teacher does not correct the unsatisfactory areas of concern within the plan time period, the teacher will be moved to a Remediation Plan. A different evaluator will be assigned by the Superintendent or designee during this phase. The new evaluator will meet with the teacher and a bargaining unit representative to outline with the specific areas of concern and develop a plan for remediation that will include:

- a minimum of two formal observations and multiple informal observations, as needed;
- resources, support and other strategies to address documented deficiencies;
- a timeline for implementing such observations, resources, support and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued; and
- indicators of success including a summative rating of *proficient* or better at the conclusion of the intensive assistance period.

A teacher who receives a rating of *developing* or *below standard* at the end of the school year may receive up to one full school year of a Remediation Plan and must achieve a rating of *proficient* by the end of the school year in which the remediation is provided.

Within five days of completing the Remediation Plan, the evaluator will complete a summary report detailing teacher performance with specific recommendations. If the teacher fails to achieve a rating of *proficient,* in the areas the plan addressed, by the completion of the Remediation Plan, the district will initiate the termination process.

Upon satisfactory completion of an Improvement and/or a Remediation Plan, the teacher will return to the regular annual evaluation process established in this plan.

If within a two year period of completing an assistance plan, the teacher receives ratings of *developing* or *below standard* in the same focus areas, an Administrator can place the teacher directly into a remediation plan.

The Assistance Plan forms are located in **Appendix J**.

TEACHER PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS

The Teacher Practice Related Indicators portion of the teacher evaluation system evaluates the teacher's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in a teacher's practice. It is comprised of two categories:

- Teacher Performance and Practice, which counts for 40%; and
- Parent Feedback, which counts for 10%.

These categories will be described in detail below.

Category #1: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

The Teacher Performance and Practice category of the model is a comprehensive review of teaching practice measured against a rubric of practice, which is based on multiple observations. The rubric that is used is the *Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or *the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching for Student and Educator Support Specialist 2013 Draft*, which are both based on the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support (see CCT table on page 14). It comprises 40% of the summative rating. Following observations, evaluators provide teachers with specific feedback to identify teacher development needs and tailor support to those needs.

Teacher Practice Framework

The Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support is organized into four domains, each with 3 attributes:

Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support

Evidence Generally Collected Through In-Class Observations

Domain 1 — **Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning²**
Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning and facilitate a positive learning community by:

1a. Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of all students.

1b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students.

1c. Maximizing instructional time by effectively managing routines and transitions.

Domain 3 — **Instruction for Active Learning**
Teachers implement instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:

3a. Implementing instructional content for learning.

3b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies.

3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction.

Evidence Generally Collected Through Non-Classroom/Reviews of Practice

Domain 2 — **Planning for Active Learning**
Teachers plan instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:

2a. Planning of instructional content that is aligned with standards, builds on students' prior knowledge and provides for appropriate level of challenge for all students.

2b. Planning instruction to cognitively engage students in the content.

2c. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress.

Domain 4 — **Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership**
Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration and leadership by:

4a. Engaging in continuous professional learning to impact instruction and student learning.

4b. Collaborating to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning.

4c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.

Observation Process

Research, such as the Gates Foundation's *Measures of Effective Teaching* study, has shown that multiple snapshots of practice conducted by multiple observers provide a more accurate picture of teacher performance than one or two observations per year. These observations don't have to cover an entire lesson to be valid. Partial period observations can provide valuable information and save observers precious time.

Observations in and of themselves aren't useful to teachers – it's the feedback based on observations that helps teachers to reach their full potential. All teachers deserve the opportunity to grow and develop through observations and timely feedback. In fact, teacher surveys conducted nationally demonstrate that most teachers are eager for more observations and feedback that they can then incorporate into their practice throughout the year.

Therefore, in the RSD 17 teacher evaluation system:

Experience Category	Number of Observations
Initial Phase Beginning/New to Region 17 Educator (1st and 2nd Year of Teaching in Region 17) and teachers with a previous summative rating of Developing or Below Standard	At least 3 formal in-class observations Multiple informal in-class observations
Educator Performance Cycle Year 3 and beyond with a previous summative rating of Proficient or Exemplary	Refer to the Performance Cycle below Multiple informal observations (at least 3)

Educator Performance Cycle

Teachers in year 3 and beyond, who receive a performance evaluation rating of *proficient* or *exemplary,* shall enter the three-year cycle consisting of the following requirements as shown below. It is mandatory that Year A be completed by all teachers in the Educator Performance Cycle a minimum of every three years.

Performance Cycle	Teacher Practice Requirements	Student Learning
Year A – Baseline Score	• At least 1 formal in-class observation • At least 1 non-classroom review of practice • Multiple informal in-class observations • 1 Parent Feedback Goal	• 1 SLO and a minimum of 2 IAGDs • 1 Whole School Learning Goal
Year B – Student Learning Outcome Focus	• Multiple informal in-class observations (at least 3) • At least 1 non-classroom review of practice • 1 Parent Feedback Goal *If proficient or exemplary, summative teacher practice rating carries forward to Year B.*	• 1 SLO and a minimum of 2 IAGDs • 1 Whole School Learning Goal
Year C – Professional Learning Focus	• Multiple informal in-class observations (at least 3) • 1 Parent Feedback Goal • At least 1 non-classroom review of practice • Professional Learning Project (See List Below) *If proficient or exemplary, summative teacher practice rating carries forward to Year C.*	• 1 SLO focused on maintenance of high level student outcomes and a minimum of 2 IAGDs • 1 Whole School Learning Goal

Year A
This is a baseline data gathering year. A teacher in Year A will complete the traditional growth form (**Appendix H**), focused equally on student learning outcomes and teacher practice.

Year B
This year has an emphasis on student outcomes. If in Year A, a teacher is rated as *proficient* or *exemplary*, the teacher's summative practice rating is maintained, unless an Administrator finds evidence to the contrary. It is expected that the teacher maintains *proficient* or *exemplary* practice while focusing more heavily on student outcomes.

Year C
This year has an emphasis on professional learning. If in Year B, a teacher is rated as *proficient* or *exemplary*, the teacher's summative practice rating is maintained, unless an Administrator finds evidence to the contrary. Additionally, the student outcome requirements will focus on the maintenance of high-level student outcomes. The teacher will then choose a Professional Learning Project as mutually agreed upon by their Administrator.   Please see Professional Learning Projects below.

Professional Learning Opportunities in Year C
A natural outgrowth of the RSD 17's Evaluation Plan is the development of a district-wide Professional Learning Committee comprised of a sub set of members from the RSD17 Evaluation and Professional Learning Committee to help guide the development and implementation of multiple learning opportunities for professionals. Effective professional learning requires human, fiscal, material, technology and time resources to achieve growth. How these resources are prioritized to align with identified professional learning needs affects access to, quality of, and effectiveness of educator learning experiences.

The district level Professional Learning Committee and the school leadership teams will ensure collaborative learning opportunities are open to all educators. Professional development opportunities, both group and individual, will be reviewed by the evaluator as a part of initial goal conference meeting. As professional reflection occurs and adjustments are needed, additional professional development options to address a group or individual need could be discussed and considered with the evaluator. Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to differentiated career pathways based on teacher ratings and targeted professional development based on areas of need and must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and teacher.

Year C Professional Learning Projects
Regional School District 17's professional learning opportunities include but are not limited to the following:

Interdisciplinary or Skills-Based Collaboration – In addition to grade level and department meetings, educators can collaborate intensively with another teacher (within or outside the department) in working on interdisciplinary units, curriculum or skill, there may be a need. This work will extend beyond the typical professional collaboration meetings. This work must be

mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teachers involved. Participants will discuss their findings, show impact/data from classroom trials and share implications on education with the school community.

1. **Action research** – Educators engage in an inquiry process conducted for the purpose of problem solving through the improvements of instructional practices. Those involved in action research follow a series of specific steps beginning with identifying a problem and ending with adopting a course of action. This work must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teachers involved. Participants will discuss their findings, show impact/data from classroom trials and share implications on education with the school community.

2. **Educator-led book studies (group or individual)** - Educators choose research based books aligned with professional goals to share with colleagues and discuss throughout the course of the year. Books should be mutually agreed upon between evaluators and teachers. Educators can compare and contrast findings from multiple sources and/or concentrate on one book that may have numerous implications in the classroom. Teachers should keep a detailed log of meetings, discussions, and classroom trials. In addition to this detailed log, book study groups will discuss their findings, show impact/data from classroom trials and share their findings with the school community.

3. **Online community participation** - Educators can create and/or participate in educational blogs or online forums for the purpose of enhancing curriculum, instruction, assessment and/or associated skills with impact on the classroom. These forums will be open to colleagues offering an on-going opportunity for professional dialogue on a variety of topics. This work must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teachers involved. Teachers should keep a detailed log of meetings, discussions, and classroom trials. In addition to this detailed log, participants will discuss their findings, show impact/data from classroom trials and share their findings with the school community.

4. **Leading professional development opportunities** – Teachers can design, plan and lead professional development opportunities at the school or district level for educators and/or parent/community members. Professional development opportunities must be offered in response to district, school and/or community needs and must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teachers involved. Teachers should keep a detailed log of evidence as it relates to research, preparations and design, and feedback from participants. In addition to these pieces of evidence, teachers must discuss their findings, show impact/data on the target audience and share their findings with the school community.

6. **Cooperating Teacher (guiding an intern)** – A teacher who is identified as a master teacher and is rated as *proficient* or *exemplary* may take on a student intern. This must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teacher involved. The student must be from an

accredited college or university program and supervised by a cooperating professor. A teacher guiding a student intern will keep a detailed log that reflects observations as they relate to experiences that the cooperating teacher creates. In addition, the cooperating teacher must show evidence of the internship being completed, reflections on the teacher's own learning, and impact on the school community.

7. **TEAM Mentor –** A teacher who is identified as a master teacher and is rated as *proficient* or *exemplary* can take on a TEAM Mentor role, which must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teachers involved. The teacher must be trained as a TEAM Mentor or become trained and take on the mentee in the same year. A teacher guiding a TEAM mentee will keep a detailed log that reflects observations as they relate to guiding the teacher through the modules for that year. In addition, the TEAM Mentor must show evidence of the modules that have been completed during the year, reflections on the teacher's own learning, and impact on the school community.

8. **Peer Sharing/Evaluation and/or Coaching** - Colleagues may pursue goals for improving student performance and professional growth by engaging in a non-evaluative educator-directed process revolving around classroom visits, objective notes/data and reflective feedback. This work must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teachers involved. Teachers will discuss their findings, show impact/data from classroom trials and share implications on education with the school community.

9. **Focused Formative Observation and Feedback** – Teachers can work with administrators on mutually agreed upon objectives requiring intense feedback and collaboration with the goal of improving in a particular focus area. Teachers will discuss their findings, show impact/data from classroom trials and share implications on practice with the evaluator.

10. **Other** – Teachers can propose an area of professional learning that is not listed above. This professional learning opportunity must be relevant to the teacher's practice and/or a specific need as it pertains to the school community. This work must be mutually agreed upon by the administrator and the teacher(s) involved. Teachers will share findings and/or results, as designed, with the school community.

Year C Additional Details
- Teachers may only enter Year C if they received *proficient* or *exemplary* for their summative rating in their previous year. Upon successful completion of the Professional Learning Project, this rating will be maintained as a summative rating for the teacher during Year C.
- The initial, mid-year and end of the year conferences will be scheduled as planned to discuss progress toward the Learning Project goals. It is expected that the Professional Learning Project will be fulfilled and that the teacher will maintain their *proficient* or *exemplary* summative rating.
- At the end of year conference, should the administrator deem that the project does not meet standard (see table below), disciplinary action may be warranted.

Does Not Meet Standard	Teacher does not meet the expectations set forth by the Professional Learning Project goals. Reflection and evidence does not sufficiently support the expectations for teacher practice.
Meets Standard	Teacher meets or exceeds expectations in meeting the requirements of the Professional Learning Project. Reflection and evidence meets or exceeds the expectations for teacher practice.

- In order to move from Year to Year in the cycle, an educator must maintain a summative rating of *proficient* or *exemplary*. If a teacher fails to meet *proficient* or *exemplary*, an Assistance Plan will ensue and teachers will be placed in the Initial Phase.
- Teachers in year 3 and beyond, who maintain a summative rating of *proficient* or *exemplary*, will be placed into the Performance Cycle (A, B, or C) by their Administrator. Administrators will work to find a balance of teachers assigned to each cycle year, while maintaining the flexibility to meet teacher and building needs.

Formal Observations
Formal in class observations will last at least 30 minutes. They include a pre-observation conference and are followed by a post-observation conference, which includes timely written and verbal feedback.

Informal Observations
Informal in class observations may take a variety of forms and may be general observations or specific to areas targeted for feedback through formative discussions between the evaluator and teacher.
Informal observations will last at least 10 minutes and may be followed by written and/or verbal feedback. Teachers generally grow in their practice when feedback is provided. The minimum expectation is that written and/or verbal feedback will be provided after 3 informal observations. Informal observations may also include non-classroom observations of practice (see below).

Non-Classroom Reviews of Practice
All professional endeavors that are relevant to teachers' instructional practices will be considered as part of their performance evaluation.
These interactions may include, but are not limited to the following:
- a) Reviews of lesson/unit plans and assessments
- b) School-based meetings
- c) Committee meetings
- d) Planning and Placement Team (PPT) meetings
- e) 504 meetings
- f) Scientifically Research Based Intervention (SRBI) meetings
- g) Call-logs or notes from parent-teacher meetings
- h) Observations of coaching/mentoring/collaborating with other teachers

Pre-Conferences
Pre-conferences are valuable for giving context for the lesson, information about the students to be observed and for setting expectations for the observation process. Pre-conferences are required for formal observations. A pre-conference may be held with a group of teachers, where appropriate.
Appendix E

Post-Conferences

Post-conferences provide a forum for reflecting on the observation through the lens of the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support and for generating action steps that will lead to the teacher's improvement. A good post conference:

- begins with an opportunity for the teacher to share his/her self-assessment of the lesson observed;
- cites objective evidence to paint a clear picture for both the teacher and the evaluator about the teacher's successes, what improvements will be made, and where future observations may focus;
- involves written and verbal feedback from the evaluator; and
- occurs within two school days of the formal observation.

Classroom observations provide the most evidence for domains 2 and 3 of the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support, but both pre-and post-conferences provide the opportunity for discussion of all four domains, including practice outside of classroom instruction (e.g., lesson plans, reflections on teaching, etc.). **Appendix G**

Feedback
The goal of feedback is to help teachers grow as educators and become more effective with each and every one of their students. With this in mind, evaluators should be clear and direct, presenting their comments in a way that is supportive and constructive. Feedback should include:

- specific evidence and ratings, where appropriate, on observed components of the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support;
- prioritized commendations and recommendations for development actions;
- next steps and supports the teacher can pursue to improve his/her practice; and
- a timeframe for follow up.

Administrators will provide verbal and written feedback after a formal observation. **Appendix F, H or I**

Teacher Performance and Practice Goal-Setting

At the start of the year, each teacher will work with his or her evaluator to develop their practice and performance goal through mutual agreement. The goal should have a clear link to student achievement and should move the teachers towards *proficient* or *exemplary* on the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support.

Progress towards goals and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations following observations throughout the year. Goals and action steps should be formally discussed during the Mid-Year Conference and the End-of-Year Conference. Although performance and practice goals are not explicitly rated as part of the Teacher Performance and Practice category, progress on goals will be reflected in the scoring of Teacher Performance and Practice evidence.

Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring

Individual Observations

Evaluators are not required to provide an overall rating for each observation, but they should provide ratings and evidence for the Framework components that were observed. During observations, evaluators should take evidence-based, scripted notes, capturing specific instances of what the teacher and students said and did in the classroom. Evidence-based notes are factual (e.g., the teacher asks: Which events precipitated the fall of Rome?) and not judgmental (e.g., the teacher asks good questions). Once the evidence has been recorded, the evaluator can align the evidence with the appropriate component(s) on the rubric and then make a judgment about which performance level the evidence supports.

Summative Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice Rating

At the end of the year, primary evaluators must determine a final Teacher Performance and Practice rating and discuss this rating with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. By the end of the year, evaluators should have collected a variety of evidence on teacher practice from the year's observations and interactions. Evaluators then analyze the consistency, trends, and significance of the evidence to determine a rating for each of the domains and their corresponding indicators. Some questions to consider while analyzing the evidence include:

> **Consistency:** What rating have I seen relatively uniform, homogenous evidence for throughout the semester? Does the evidence paint a clear, unambiguous picture of the teacher's performance in this area?

> **Trends:** Have I seen improvement over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes? Have I seen regression or setbacks over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes?

> **Significance:** Are some data more valid than others? (Do I have notes or ratings from "meatier" lessons or interactions where I was able to better assess this aspect of performance?)

The final Teacher Performance and Practice rating is determined by the evaluator, following discussion with the educator, by holistically reviewing evidence from all observations across the four domains of the Teacher Practice Framework and the Parent Feedback Goal. Ratings collected across the four domains and on the rating for the Parent Feedback Goal will be viewed as five equally weighted parts of the Teacher Performance and Practice rating. Determination of the overall Teacher Practice rating will be based on the preponderance of evidence across the five areas. **Appendix H or I**

For instance:

An Educator who is rated as proficient in two of four domains across the full year of observations, is rated as *exemplary* in one domain and as *developing* in one domain, and who has met the parent feedback goal established for the year would, by the preponderance of evidence, receive an overall Performance and Practice rating of *proficient* (3) for the year. (See Below)

Domain	Preponderance of Evidence
Domain 1	Proficient
Domain 2	Proficient
Domain 3	Exemplary
Domain 4	Developing
Parent Feedback Goal	Proficient
Overall rating	Proficient

Category #2: Parent Feedback (10%)

As described above, the feedback from parents will be used as a component of the Teacher Practice and Performance Indicators focus area.

The process described below focuses on:
  (1) conducting a whole-school parent survey (data is aggregated at the school level); and/or using approaches such as focus groups, interviews, or teacher' own surveys to collect information from parents.
  (2) determining at least one school-level parent goal based on survey feedback;
  (3) teacher and evaluator identifying **one** related parent goal and setting improvement targets;
  (4) measuring progress on growth targets; and
  (5) determining a teacher's summative rating. This parent feedback rating shall be based on four performance levels.

1. Administration of Parent Surveys
Whole school parent surveys should be conducted at the whole-school level and parent feedback will be aggregated appropriately. In addition to the whole school survey, teachers may use approaches such as focus groups, interviews, or their own surveys to collect information from parents.

The surveys selected by a district must be valid (that is, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time).

Parent surveys must be administered in a way that allows parents to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys should be confidential and survey responses should not be tied to parents' names. The whole-school parent survey should be administered every spring and trends analyzed from year-to-year.

2. Determining School-Level Parent Goals
Principals and teachers should review the parent survey results at the beginning of the school year to identify areas of need and set general parent engagement goals based on the survey results.
Ideally, this goal-setting process would occur between the principal and teachers (possibly during faculty meetings) in August or September so agreement could be reached on at least one improvement goal for the entire school.

3. Selecting a Parent Engagement Goal and Improvement Targets
After these school-level goals have been set, teachers will determine through consultation and mutual agreement with their evaluators **one** related parent goal they would like to pursue as part of their evaluation. Possible goals include improving communication with parents, helping

parents become more effective in support of homework, improving parent-teacher conferences, etc.

Teachers will also set improvement targets related to the goal they select. For instance, if the goal is to improve parent communication, an improvement target could be specific to sending more regular correspondence to parents such as sending bi-weekly updates to parents or developing a new website for their class. Part of the evaluator's job is to ensure (1) the goal is related to the overall school improvement parent goals, and (2) that the improvement targets are aligned and attainable.

Appendix H or I

4. <u>Measuring Progress on Growth Targets</u>
Teachers and their evaluators should use their judgment in setting growth/improvement targets for the parent feedback category. There are two ways a teacher can measure and demonstrate progress on their growth targets. A teacher can (1) measure how successfully they implement a strategy to address an area of need (like the examples in the previous section), and/or (2) they can collect evidence directly from parents to measure parent-level indicators they generate. For example, a teacher could conduct interviews with parents or a brief parent survey to see if they improved on their growth target.

5. <u>Arriving at a Parent Feedback Rating</u>
The Parent Feedback rating should reflect the degree to which a teacher successfully reaches his/her parent goal and improvement targets. This is accomplished through a review of evidence provided by the teacher and application of the following scale:

Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Did not meet the goal	Partially met the goal	Met the goal	Exceeded the goal

STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS

The Student Outcomes Related Indicators capture the teacher's impact on students. Every teacher is in the profession to help children learn and grow, and teachers already think carefully about what knowledge, skills and talents they are responsible for nurturing in their students each year. As a part of the RSD 17 Evaluation and Support process, teachers will document those aspirations and   anchor them in data.

Student Related Indicators includes two categories:

- Student growth and development, which counts for 45%; and
- *Either* whole-school student learning *or* student feedback *or* a combination of the two, which counts for 5% of the total evaluation rating.

These categories will be described in detail below.

Category #3: Student Growth and Development (45%)

Overview of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

Each teacher's students, individually and as a group, are different from other teachers' students, even in the same grade level or subject at the same school. For student growth and development to be measured for teacher evaluation purposes, it is imperative to use a method that takes each teacher's assignment, students and context into account. Connecticut, like many other states and localities around the nation, has selected a goal-setting process called **Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)** as the approach for measuring student growth during the school year.

SLOs will support teachers in using a planning cycle that will be familiar to most educators:

SLO Phase I: Learn about this year's students	→	SLO Phase 2: Set goals for student learning	→	SLO Phase 3: Monitor students' progress	→	SLO Phase 4: Assess student outcomes relative to goals

While this process should feel generally familiar, teachers will be asked to set more specific and measureable targets than they may have done in the past, and to develop them through consultation with colleagues in the same grade level or teaching the same subject and through mutual agreement with supervisors. The four SLO phases are described in detail below:

SLO Phase I:
Learn about
this year's
students

This first phase is the discovery phase, just before the start of the school year and in its first few weeks. Once teachers know their rosters, they will access as much information as possible about their new students' baseline skills and abilities, relative to the grade level or course the teacher is teaching. End-of-year tests from the prior spring, prior grades, benchmark assessments and quick demonstration assessments are all examples of sources teachers can tap to understand both individual student and group strengths and challenges. This information will be critical for goal setting in the next phase.

SLO Phase 2:
Set 1 SLO
(goal for learning)

To create their SLO, teachers will follow these four steps:

Step 1: Decide on the Student Learning Objective

The objective will be a broad goal for student learning. It should address a central purpose of the teacher's assignment and it should pertain to a large proportion of his/her students. A SLO should reflect high expectations for student learning - at least a year's worth of growth (or a semester's worth for shorter courses) – and should be aligned to relevant state, national (e.g., common core), or district standards for the grade level or course. Depending on the teacher's assignment, the objective might aim for content mastery (more likely at the secondary level) or it might aim for skill development

(more likely at the elementary level or in arts classes).

Teachers are encouraged to collaborate with grade-level and/or subject-matter colleagues in the creation of the SLO. Teachers with similar assignments may have identical objectives although they will be individually accountable for their own students' results.

The following are examples of SLOs based on student data:

Grade/Subject	Student Learning Objective
6th Grade Social Studies	Students will produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.
9th Grade Information Literacy	Students will master the use of digital tools for learning to gather, evaluate and apply information to solve problems and accomplish tasks.
11th Grade Algebra II	Students will be able to analyze complex, real-world scenarios using mathematical models to interpret and solve problems.
9th Grade English/Language Arts	Students will cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
1st and 2nd Grade Tier 3 Reading	Students will improve reading accuracy and comprehension leading to an improved attitude and approach toward more complex reading tasks.

Step 2: Select Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)

An **Indicator of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD)** is the specific evidence, with a quantitative target, that will demonstrate whether the objective was met. Based on the CT State Board of Education - Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (May 7, 2014) a SLO must include at least two IAGDs (22.5% +22.5%).

As stated in the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, a **standardized assessment** is characterized by the following attributes:

- Administered and scored in a consistent – or "standard" – manner;
- Aligned to a set of academic or performance "standards;"
- Broadly-administered (e.g., nation-or statewide);
- Commercially-produced; and
- Often administered only once a year, although some standardized assessments are administered two or three times per year.

Each teacher will write one SLO (45%). The SLO will have at least 2 IAGDs at 22.5% each. Teachers

who have a standardized test/assessment/indicator:

Teachers whose students take a standardized test/assessment/indicator (see Note below):
- Will create one SLO.
- SLO must have two IAGDs (22.5% + 22.5%).
- One IAGD must be based on standardized indicators.
- Second IAGD must be based on non-standardized indicators.
- More than two non-standardized indicators are allowed.
- The emphasis is on student growth over time.
    - The IAGD with the standardized indicator may not be judged solely on one test score.
    - There must be interim assessments that lead to the standardized indicator (test).
    - They are to be included in the overall score for that IAGD.
- All plans are to be mutually agreed upon by the teacher and the administrator.

Teachers who have no standardized indicators:
- Will create one SLO.
- SLO must have two IAGDs (22.5% + 22.5%).
- Each IAGD will be based on non-standardized indicators.
- More than two non-standardized indicators are allowed.
- The emphasis is on student growth over time.
    - **If** the IAGD with non-standardized indicator includes a final test (non-standardized/teacher made), it may not be judged solely on one test score.
    - There must be interim assessments that lead to the non-standardized indicator (test).
    - The interim work is to be included in the overall score for that IAGD.
- All plans are to be mutually agreed upon by the teacher and the administrator.

Note: "For the 2014-15 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval, pursuant to PEAC's flexibility recommendation on January 29, 2014 and the State Board of Education's action on February 6, 2014." (CT State Board of Education - Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, May 7, 2014) Other standardized indicators will be used, if available. **Appendix L**

Each indicator should make clear (1) what evidence will be examined, (2) what level of performance is targeted, and (3) what proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level. Indicators can also address student subgroups, such as high or low-performing students or ELL students. It is through the Phase I examination of student data that teachers will determine what level of performance to target for which students.

Since indicator targets are calibrated for the teacher's particular students, teachers with similar assignments may use the same evidence for their indicators, but they would be unlikely to have identical targets. For example, all 2nd grade teachers in a district might use the same reading assessment as their IAGD, but the performance target and/or the proportion of students expected to achieve proficiency would likely vary among 2nd grade teachers.

Taken together, all SLO indicators, if achieved, would provide evidence that the objective was met. Here are some examples of indicators that might be applied to the previous SLO examples:

Sample SLOs showing at least one IAGD

Grade/Subject	Student Learning Objective (SLO)	Indicators of Academic Growth and Development [IAGD(s)]
6th Grade Social Studies	Students will produce effective and well rounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.	**By May 15:** n Students who scored a 0-1 out of 12 on the pre-assessment will score 6 or better n Students who scored a 2-4 will score 8 or better. n Students who scored 5-6 will score 9 or better. n Students who scored 7 will score 10 or better *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) that outlines differentiated targets based on pre-assessments.*
9th Grade Information Literacy	Students will master the use of digital tools for learning to gather, evaluate and apply information to solve problems and accomplish tasks.	**By May 30:** n 90%-100% of all students will be proficient (scoring a 3 or 4) or higher on 5 of the 6 standards (as measured by 8 items) on the digital literacy assessment rubric. *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) illustrating a minimum proficiency standard for a large proportion of students.*
11th Grade Algebra 2	Students will be able to analyze complex, real world scenarios using mathematical models to interpret and solve problems.	**By May 15:** n 80% of Algebra 2 students will score an 85 or better on a district Algebra 2 math benchmark. *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) illustrating a minimum proficiency standard for a large proportion of students.*
9th Grade ELA	Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly, as well as inferences drawn from the text.	**By June 1:** n 27 students who scored 50-70 on the pre-test will increase scores by 18 points on the post test. n 40 students who score 30-49 will increase by 15 points. n 10 students who scored 0-29 will increase by 10 points. *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) that has been differentiated to meet the needs of varied student performance groups.*

| 1st and 2nd Grade Tier 3 Reading | Students will improve reading accuracy and comprehension leading to an improved attitude and approach toward more complex reading tasks. | **By June:**
IAGD #1: Students will increase their attitude towards reading by at least 7 points from baseline on the full scale score of the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey, as recommended by authors, McKenna and Kear.
IAGD #2: Students will read instructional level text with 95% or better accuracy on the DRA.
▪ Grade 1- Expected outcome- Level 14-16
▪ Grade 2- Expected outcome- Level 22-24
These are two IAGDs using two assessments/measures of progress. IAGD #2 has also been differentiated to meet the needs of varied student performance groups. |

Step 3: Provide Additional Information

During the goal-setting process, **(Appendix A or B)** teachers and evaluators will document the following:

- the rationale for the objective, including relevant standards;
- any important technical information about the indicator evidence (like timing or scoring plans);
- the baseline data that was used to set each IAGD;
- interim assessments the teacher plans to use to gauge students' progress toward the SLO during the school year (optional); and
- any training or support the teacher thinks would help improve the likelihood of meeting the SLO (optional).

Step 4: Submit SLO to Evaluator for Approval

A SLO is a proposal until the evaluator approves it (**Appendix H or I**). While teachers and evaluators should confer during the goal-setting process to select a mutually agreed-upon SLO, ultimately, the evaluator must formally approve the SLO proposal.

The evaluator will examine the SLO relative to three criteria described below. SLO must meet all three criteria to be approved. If it does not meet one or more criteria, the evaluator will provide written comments and discuss feedback with the teacher during the fall Goal-Setting Conference. A SLO that is not approved must be revised and resubmitted to the evaluator within ten days.

SLO Approval Criteria

Priority of Content	**Quality of Indicators**	**Rigor of Objective/Indicators**
Objective is deeply relevant to teacher's assignment and addresses a large proportion of his/her students.	Indicators provide specific, measurable evidence. The indicators provide evidence about students' progress over the school year or semester during which they are with the teacher.	Objective and indicator(s) are attainable but ambitious and taken together, represent at least a year's worth of growth for students (or appropriate growth for a shorter interval of instruction).

Once the SLO is approved, teachers should monitor students' progress towards the objectives. They can, for example, examine student work products, administer interim assessments and track students' accomplishments and struggles. Teachers can share their interim findings with colleagues during collaborative time, and they can keep their evaluator apprised of progress.

If a teacher's assignment changes or if his/her student population shifts significantly, the SLO can be adjusted during the Mid-Year Conference between the evaluator and the teacher.

Teachers should collect the evidence required by their indicators and submit it to their evaluator at the mid-year and/or end of year conference. Teachers will complete the Professional Goals and Growth Evaluation Form which asks teachers to reflect on the SLO outcomes. **Teachers must show growth toward goals as well as reflection and evidence as to how students not meeting goal were addressed.** Evaluators will review the evidence and the teacher's self-assessment and assign one of four ratings to each SLO:

Did Not Meet	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.
Partially Met	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress towards the goal was made.
Met	All or most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s). Teacher met expectations in reflection and evidence supporting student growth toward goals and beyond.
Exceeded	All or most students met and/or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s). Teacher exceeded expectations in reflection and evidence supporting student growth toward goals and beyond.

The individual SLO rating and the student growth and development rating will be shared and discussed with teacher during the End-of-Year Conference.

NOTE: For a SLO that includes an indicator based on standardized tests, results may not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the last day of school deadline. In this instance,

evidence for other indicators in the SLO should be available and the evaluator can score the SLO on that basis.

However, once the standardized test evidence is available, the evaluator is required to score or rescore the SLO, then determine if the new score changes the teacher's final (summative) rating. The evaluation rating can be amended and submitted at that time as needed, but no later than September 15th of the following year.

The evaluator may score each IAGD separately, and then average those scores for the SLO score, or he/she can look at the results as a body of evidence regarding the accomplishment of the objective and score the SLO holistically.

Category #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator and/or Student Feedback (5%)

Districts can decide to use a whole-school student learning indicator (option 1), student feedback (option 2), or a combination of the two (option 3) to determine this fourth category.

Option 1: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator

For districts that include the whole-school student learning indicator in teacher evaluations, a teacher's indicator rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the principal's evaluation rating at that school. For most schools, this will be based on the school performance index (SPI), which correlates to the whole-school student learning.

Option 2: Student Feedback

Districts can use feedback from students, collected through whole-school or teacher-level surveys, to comprise this category of a teacher's evaluation rating.

Research, including the Gates Foundation's *Measures of Effective Teaching* study, has shown that student surveys can be valid and reliable indicators of teacher performance and that student feedback about a teacher is correlated with student performance in that class. Additionally, student surveys provide teachers with actionable information they can use to improve their practice feedback that teachers would not necessarily receive elsewhere in the evaluation process.

Some educators express concerns about student surveys, including that student survey instruments must not be "popularity contests" and that students must take the surveys seriously. The following implementation approach, drawn from best practices across the country, can mitigate these issues. School districts are encouraged to work closely with their teachers on the development of the student survey category.

Eligible Teachers and Alternative Measures
Student surveys will not be applicable and appropriate for all teachers. Ultimately, school districts should use their judgment in determining whether student surveys should be included in a particular teacher's summative rating. Here are important guidelines to consider:

- Students in grades K-3 should not be surveyed unless an age-appropriate instrument is available.
- Special education students who would not be able to respond to the survey, even with accommodations, should not be surveyed.
- Generally, surveys should not be used to evaluate a teacher if fewer than 15 students would be surveyed or if fewer than 13 students ultimately complete the survey.

When student surveys are not appropriate for a particular teacher, the 5% allocated for student feedback should be replaced with the whole-school student learning indicator described in Option #1.

Survey Instruments used with students

Districts may use existing survey instruments or they develop their own. Student survey instruments should be aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) and the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support, whenever possible.

Districts may choose to use different surveys for different grade levels, such as an elementary survey for students in grades 4-6 and a secondary survey for grades 6-12. Districts may also choose to use different surveys for different types of classes. For example, a district might establish a standard survey for all 6-12 classes and then add additional questions for core classes such as English and Math.

The surveys selected by a district must be valid (that is, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time).

Districts are encouraged to use instruments that will offer teachers constructive feedback they can use to improve their practice. Districts may include feedback-only questions that are not used for evaluation purposes and districts may allow individual schools and teachers to add questions to the end of the survey, where feasible.

Teachers who develop their own survey for their own class or classes should strive to create a useable survey that reflects their students and best practices to the greatest extent possible.

Survey Administration
Student surveys must be administered in a way that allows students to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys should be confidential, and survey responses must not be tied to students' names.

If a secondary school teacher has multiple class periods, students should be surveyed in all classes, as appropriate. If an elementary school teacher has multiple groups of students, districts should use their judgment in determining whether to survey all students or only a particular group.

Fall Baseline and Feedback Survey
If it is feasible, it is recommended but not required that schools conduct two student feedback surveys each year. The first, administered in the fall, will not affect a teacher's evaluation but could be used as a baseline for that year's targets, instead of using data from the previous school year. The second, administered in the spring, will be used to calculate the teacher's summative rating and

provide valuable feedback that will help teachers achieve their goals and grow professionally. Additionally, by using a fall survey as a baseline rather than data from the previous year, teachers will be able to set better goals because the same group of students will be completing both the baseline survey and the final survey. If conducting two surveys in the same academic year is not possible, then teachers should use the previous spring survey to set growth targets.

Establishing Goals
Teachers and their evaluators should use their judgment in setting goals for the student feedback category. In setting a goal, a teacher must decide what he/she wants the goal to focus on. A goal will usually refer to a specific survey question (e.g., "My teacher makes lessons interesting."). However, some survey instruments group questions into categories or topics, such as "Classroom Control" or "Communicating Course Content," and a goal may also refer to a category rather than an individual question.

Additionally, a teacher (or the district) must decide how to measure results for the selected question or topic. CSDE recommends that teachers measure performance in terms of the percentage of students who responded favorably to the question. (Virtually all student survey instruments have two favorable answer choices for each question.) For example, if the survey instrument asks students to respond to questions with "Strongly Disagree," "Disagree," "Neutral," "Agree," and "Strongly Agree," performance on a goal would be measured as the percentage of students who responded "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to the corresponding question. Next, a teacher must set a numeric performance target. This target should be based on growth or on maintaining performance that is already high. Teachers are encouraged to bear in mind that growth becomes harder as performance increases. For this reason, we recommend that teachers set maintenance of high performance targets (rather than growth targets) when current performance exceeds 70% of students responding favorably to a question. **Appendix H or I**

Finally, where feasible, a teacher may optionally decide to focus a goal on a particular subgroup of students. (Surveys may ask students for demographic information, such as grade level, gender and race.) For example, if a teacher's fall survey shows that boys give much lower scores than girls in response to the survey question "My teacher cares about me," the teacher might set a growth goal for how the teacher's male students respond to that question.

The following are examples of effective goals:
- The percentage of students who "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" with "My teacher believes I can do well" will increase from 50% to 60%.
- The percentage of students who "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" with "My teacher makes what we're learning interesting" will remain at 75%.
- The percentage of 9th graders who "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" with "I feel comfortable asking my teacher for extra help" will increase from 60% to 70%.

Arriving at a Student Feedback Summative Rating:
In most cases, summative ratings should reflect the degree to which a teacher makes growth on feedback measures, using data from the prior school year or the fall of the current year as a baseline for setting growth targets. For teachers with high ratings already, summative ratings should reflect the degree to which ratings remain high.

This is accomplished in the following steps, undertaken by the teacher being evaluated through mutual agreement with the evaluator:

1. Review survey results from prior period (previous school year or fall survey).
2. Set **one** measurable goal for growth or performance (see above).
3. Later in the school year, administer surveys to students.
4. Aggregate data and determine whether the teacher achieved the goal.
5. Assign a summative rating, using the following scale to be discussed and finalized with their evaluator during the Mid or End-of-Year Conference.

Below standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Did not meet the goal	Partially met the goal	Met the goal	Exceeded the goal

Option 3: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator and Student Feedback
As previously mentioned, districts can use whole-school student learning indicators for certain teachers and feedback from students for others depending on grade level.

NOTE: If the whole-school student learning indicator rating is not available when the summative rating is calculated, then the student growth and development score will be weighted 50 and the whole-school student learning indicator will be weighted 0. However, once the state data is available, the evaluator should revisit the final rating and amend at that time as needed, but no later than September 15th of the following school year.

SUMMATIVE TEACHER EVALUATION SCORING

Summative Scoring
The individual summative teacher evaluation rating will be based on the four categories of performance, grouped in two major focus areas: Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Teacher Practice Related Indicators.

Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings:

Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

Proficient – Meeting indicators of performance

Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

Below Standard – Not meeting indicators of performance

The rating will be determined using the following steps **(Appendix H or I):**

1) Determine a <u>Teacher Practice Related Indicators score</u> by combining the observation of teacher performance and practice score and the parent feedback score.
2) Determine a <u>Student Outcomes Related Indicators score</u> by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicator or student feedback score.
3) Use Summative Matrix to <u>determine Summative Rating.</u>

Each step is illustrated below:

1) Determine a Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating by combining the observation of teacher performance and practice score and the parent feedback score.

   Each of the four domains of the observation of teacher performance and practice counts for 10% of the total rating and parent feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. As described previously these are then holistically summed as shown in the following chart.

Domain	Preponderance of Evidence
Domain 1	Proficient
Domain 2	Proficient
Domain 3	Exemplary
Domain 4	Developing
Parent Feedback Goal	Proficient
Overall rating	Proficient

2) Determine a Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicator or student feedback score.

   The student growth and development category counts for 45% of the total rating and the whole-school student learning indicator or student feedback category counts for 5% of the total rating.

Category	Rating
Student Growth and Development (SLO) Summative Rating (45%)	Proficient
Whole School Student Learning Indicator or Student Feedback Summative Rating (5%)	Exemplary
Overall Student Outcomes Rating	Proficient

3) Use the Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating

Identify the rating for each focus area and follow the respective column and row to the center of the table. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating is *proficient* and the Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating is *proficient*. The summative rating is therefore *proficient*. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of *exemplary* for Teacher Practice and a rating of *below standard* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a summative.

Overall Student Outcomes Rating \ Overall Leader Practice Rating	4	3	2	1
4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Gather further information
3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing
2	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
1	Gather further information	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

Adjustment of Summative Rating

Summative ratings must be completed for all teachers by the last day of school. Should state standardized test data not be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for a teacher may be significantly impacted by state standardized test data, the evaluator may recalculate the teacher's summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than September 15th of the following year. These adjustments should inform the goal setting process in the new school year

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

An educator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said educator receives at least two sequential *developing* ratings or one *below standard* rating at any time.

An educator shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives a rating of exemplary, proficient or no more than one sequential rating of developing.

Dispute-Resolution Process

A teacher should, with the assistance of a bargaining unit representative, initiate the dispute resolution process when the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period/timeline, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating(s).

- A written dispute resolution form must be submitted within 10 school days after occurrence of the event giving rise to the dispute. Resolutions must be topic-specific and submitted to the Superintendent's office on the Dispute Resolution form in **Appendix K.**
- A panel shall be composed of the Superintendent, two administrators (the Superintendent, where possible, shall choose 2 administrators that do not supervise the teacher in dispute), and two members of the Haddam-Killingworth Education Association (appointed by the President of the Association).
- The panel must meet, make a decision, and issue a written decision no longer than 15 school days after the dispute is submitted.

Appendices

Appendix A: Goal Setting Protocol

Goal Setting Protocol

Prior to the Goal Setting Conference:

Discovery Phase

Evaluator: Presents Continuous Improvement Plan to staff.

Teacher: Will enter the Discovery Phase of the SLO (Student Learning Objective) process.

Teacher examines applicable student data and considers the following:
- What are the strengths of my students?
- Where are their areas for growth?
- What will I need to do to help them grow?
- How does this relate to the Continuous Improvement Plan?

Development of Student Learning Outcome (SLOs)

Teacher: Will develop and write one SLO and be prepared to discuss it in the goal conference.

A Student Learning Outcome (SLO) must include *at least two* **Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD).** An IAGD is the specific evidence, with a quantitative target, that will demonstrate whether the objective was met.

Each IAGD should make clear (1) what evidence will be examined, (2) what level of performance is targeted, and (3) what proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level. Indicators can also address student subgroups, such as high or low-performing students or ELL students.

Teachers whose students take a standardized assessment will create a SLO with one IAGD that is based on a standardized indicator and one IAGD that may be based on a maximum of one additional standardized indicator *or* a non-standardized indicator. If standardized assessments do not exist for a content area, then the SLO's IAGDs will be based on two non-standardized indicators.

Student Feedback and/or Whole School Student Learning Indicator

Evaluator: Will present, review and discuss with the school personnel the state school performance index, student surveys and other applicable information relating to this area. The evaluator may set the path of the school in relation to student feedback and/or whole school student learning indicators.

Teacher: Will write one goal that uses data/student feedback to bolster instruction and/or culture in the school or classroom. This goal can be school-wide, if applicable.

Development of Teacher Performance and Practice Goal(s)

Teacher: Reviews prior evaluation(s) and the CT Framework for Teacher Evaluation & Support and considers the following:
- What feedback have I received in the past that helps me identify an area of focus within the framework?
- Where do I think I need to grow?
- What are some ways that I think my evaluator can support my growth?

Teacher: Will write 1 goal for the year that will provide focus for observations and feedback and be prepared to discuss this in the goal conference. This goal can overlap with the SLO, if the teacher deems it appropriate and /or necessary.

Parent Feedback
Evaluator: Must review and discuss with the school personnel the parent surveys from the end of the year.

Evaluator and teacher: Principals and teachers should review parent survey results at the beginning of the school year to identify areas of need and set general parent engagement goals based on the survey results. After school level goals have been set you and your evaluator will collaborate to determine one parent related goal to pursue.

Teacher: Will write one parent feedback goal and be prepared to discuss this in the goal conference.

Goal Conference Meeting
Teacher and Evaluator will schedule a meeting by Oct. 15th to discuss goals.

Teacher will complete a Professional Growth and Evaluation Form (See Appendix H) in preparation for the conference with the evaluator. The Professional Growth and Evaluation Form should be submitted to the evaluator 24 hours in advance.

Teacher and evaluator will meet to review the goals and revise if necessary. All goals will be finalized and mutually agreed upon by November 15th.

Goal Setting Conference Protocol (40 minutes)
Professional Goals and Growth Evaluation Form must be submitted to the observing administrator at least 24 hours prior to the goal setting conference.

Teacher Practice

Professional Practice Goal (15 min.):

Teacher: Discusses their professional practice goal following the guiding questions below

- What is the goal?
- What is the rationale?
- How will the goal be measured?
- What data will be used as evidence for the goal being met?
- What is the time frame of your goal?
- What support do you need to reach your goal?

Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the goal to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

Teacher and Evaluator: Agree on a goal and the time frame for the goal being met.

Parent Feedback Goal (5 min.):

Teacher: Discusses their parent feedback goal following the guiding questions below

- What is the goal? Is it an individual or school goal?
- What is the rationale? How does it support the school community?
- How will the goal be measured?
- What data will be used as evidence for the goal being met?
- What is the time frame of your goal?
- What support do you need to reach your goal?

Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the goal to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

Teacher and Evaluator: Agree on a goal and the time frame for the goal being met.

Student Outcomes

Student Learning Objective Goal (SLO) (15 min.):

Teacher: Discusses the SLO following the guiding questions below:

- What is the SLO?
- What is the rationale for the SLO?
  - Baseline or trend data that may be used
  - Student population
- What Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs) will be used as evidence for the SLO being met?
- How will the outcome of the SLO be measured?
  Some examples may include:
  - Key assessments for data collection
  - Rubrics aligned to learning content
- What is the time frame of the SLO being met?
- What support is needed to achieve the SLO?
- Is the SLO embedded in the school Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP)?

Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the SLO to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

Teacher and Evaluator: Agree on the SLO and the time frame for the SLO being met.

Whole School Student Learning and/or Student Feedback (5 min.):

Teacher: Discusses whole school student learning and/or student feedback goal following the guiding questions below:
  - o   What is the goal? Is it an individual or school goal?
  - o   What is the rationale? How does it support the school community?
  - o   How will the goal be measured?
  - o   What data will be used as evidence for the goal being met?
  - o   What is the time frame of your goal?
  - o   What support do you need to reach your goal?

Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the goal to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

Teacher and Evaluator: Agree on a goal and the time frame for the goal being met.

Appendix C: Mid-Year and End-of-Year Conference Protocols

<u>Mid-year and End-of-Year Conference and Feedback Protocol (40 minutes)</u>
<u>Updated Professional Goals and Growth Evaluation Form must be submitted to the observing administrator at least 24 hours prior to the conference.</u>

<u>Mid-Year/End-of Year Review (40 min.):</u>

<u>Professional Practice</u>

Teacher Performance and Practice Goal (10 min.):
> Teacher: Discusses professional practice goal following the guiding questions below
>> o   What evidence have you gathered?
>> o   What steps remain in reaching your goal?
>> o   What support do you still need to reach your goal?
>> o   If you have finished your goal, was it successful? How do you know?

> Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the goal to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

> Teacher and Evaluator: Plan for completion of goal or discuss the rating of the completed goal.

Observations of Teacher Performance and Practice (5 min):
Teacher and Evaluator: Discuss formal and informal observations that have occurred at this point.
>> o   Discuss observations made in each Domain.
>> o   Review of previous discussions/recommendations in each Domain.
>> o   What are your next steps?
>> o   What support do you still need?

Parent Feedback Goal (5 min.):
> Teacher: Discusses parent feedback goal following the guiding questions below:
>> o   What evidence have you gathered?
>> o   What steps remain in reaching your goal?
>> o   What support do you still need to reach your goal?
>> o   If you have finished your goal, was it successful? How do you know?

> Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the goal to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

> Teacher and Evaluator: Plan for completion of goal or discuss the rating of the completed goal.

<u>Student Outcomes</u>

Student Learning Objective Goal (SLO) (15 min.):
> Teacher: Discusses the SLO following the guiding questions below:
>> o   What evidence have you gathered?
>> o   What steps remain in reaching your SLO?
>> o   What support do you still need to reach your SLO?
>> o   If you have finished your SLO, was it successful? How do you know?

> Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the SLO to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

Teacher and Evaluator: Plan for completion of the SLO or discuss the rating of the completed SLO.

Whole School Student Learning and/or Student Feedback (5 min.):

Teacher: Discusses whole school student learning and/or student feedback goal following the guiding questions below:
- What evidence have you gathered?
- What steps remain in reaching your goal?
- What support do you still need to reach your goal?
- If you have finished your goal, was it successful? How do you know?

Evaluator: Provides feedback, critical questioning and support. Evaluator may ask the teacher to revise the goal to resubmit, based on previous discussions, data or evidence.

Teacher and Evaluator: Plan for completion of goal or discuss the rating of the completed goal.

Appendix D: Sample Lesson Plan for Formal Observation

RSD17 SAMPLE LESSON PLAN DOCUMENT FOR FORMAL OBSERVATION

Teacher:
Grade Level:
Date of lesson:

This lesson plan should be completed and provided to the evaluator at least 24 hours prior to the pre-observation conference and the formal observation. RSD17 does not recommend use of this form for every day planning purposes.

Content Standards: Identify one or two **primary** content standards (including CCSS, if applicable) that this lesson is designed to help students attain. Include literacy in the content area, and ELL standards, if applicable.

Objective(s) for Lesson: Identify specific and measurable content objectives/teaching point(s) for this lesson. Include language objectives and/or 21st Century Skills, if applicable. What will the students be able to do?

Placement of Lesson within Broader Curriculum/Context: Where does this lesson fall within the sequence of the larger content standards or curriculum? Is it at the beginning, middle or end of a sequence of lessons/or unit leading to attainment of the content standards? How will the outcomes of this lesson and student learning impact subsequent instruction?

Learner Background: Describe the students' prior knowledge or skill, and/or their present level, related to the learning objective(s) and the content of this lesson, using data from pre-assessment, as appropriate.

Plan for the lesson: Describe what instructional strategies you will use, and the learning activities in which students will be engaged in order to gain the key knowledge and skills identified in the student learning objective(s), and time frames you set out. This may also include a description of how you will *initiate* (set expectations for learning and purpose) and *close* (understanding the purpose) the lesson.

Materials/Resources: List the materials you will use in each learning activity including any technological resources.

Instructional Grouping: Identify the instructional grouping/s (whole class, small groups, pairs, individuals) you will use in each lesson segment and approximate time frames for each.

Formative/Summative Assessment: How will you ask students to demonstrate mastery of the student learning objective(s)? What data or evidence of student learning will be collected through the assessment?

Students Needing Differentiated Instruction: Identify several students with learning differences. Students should represent a range of ability and/or achievement levels, including students with IEPs, gifted and talented students, struggling learners, and English language learners.

Which students do you anticipate may struggle with the content/learning objectives of this lesson?		
Student initials or group	Evidence that the student needs differentiated instruction	How will you differentiate instruction **in this lesson** to support student learning?

Which students will need opportunities for enrichment/higher level of challenge?		
Student initials or group	Evidence that the student needs differentiated instruction	How will you differentiate instruction **in this lesson** to support student learning?

Be prepared to discuss the pre-observation protocol questions in your pre-conference meeting.

Pre-Observation Conference Protocol (20 minutes)

Domain 1 – Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning

Lesson plans and relevant artifacts must be submitted to the observing administrator at least 24 hours prior to the pre-observation conference.

Lesson Overview: (10 Minutes):
- Teacher: Lesson Plan
  - Content Standards: Identify one or two primary content standards, including national, state or local standards.
  - Specific and measurable student learning objectives for lesson
  - Placement of lesson in broader unit/curriculum
  - Basic student background or information pertinent to lesson development
  - Assessment / pre and or post / formative and or summative
  - Literacy and Numeracy integration strategies if included in this lesson
  - Sequence of lesson components
- Teacher: Lesson Artifacts
  - Teacher may bring any and all supporting artifacts including but not limited to: pre-assessments, prior activities, lesson resources, seating charts, student work, etc.
- Evaluator:
  - Asks clarifying questions related to lesson design

Area/s of Focus: (10 minutes)
- Teacher: Identify desired Area/s of Focus (from the Framework for Teaching Domains)
  - What do you think the area/s of focus should be? Why?
  - How did your planning relate to this area of focus work?
- Evaluator:
  - Review teacher suggested area/s of focus and may suggest additions and or modifications
  - Clarify mutually agreed upon area/s of focus

Appendix F: Observation Feedback Form

Teacher: **Date of Observation:**

Evaluator: **Class Observed:**

	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	Not Observed
Domain 1. Classroom Environment, Student Engagement, and Commitment to Learning					
1 a. Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful to the learning needs of students.					
1 b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students.					
1 c. Maximizing instructional time by effectively managing routines and transitions.					
Domain 2. Planning for Active Learning					
2 a. Planning of instructional content is aligned with standards, builds on students' prior knowledge and provides for appropriate level of challenge for all students.					
2 b. Planning instructional strategies to cognitively engage students in the content.					
2 c. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor ongoing student progress.					
Domain 3: Instruction for Active Learning					
3 a. Implementing instructional content for learning.					
3 b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies.					
3 c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction					
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership					
4 a. Engaging in continuous professional growth to impact instruction and student learning.					
4 b. Collaborating to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning.					
4 c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.					

Three most critical items for feedback, one of which much be an area of growth.

At Least one option for professional learning related to an area for growth.

Appendix G: Post Observation Conference Protocol

Post Observation Conference and Feedback Protocol

Area of Focus Debrief (15 Minutes):
- Evaluator: Reviews the area of focus agreed upon in teacher goals and pre-conference
  - This is just a brief calibrating reminder of the focus area
- Teacher: Reflection on Area/s of Focus
  - How do you think the area of focus went?
  - How did your planning, related to this area of focus work, impact the lesson? What if anything did you do differently than you planned?
  - What would you do differently next time related to this area?
- Evaluator: Reflection on Area of Focus
  - Describe evidence collected (observational) related to the area of focus.
  - Describe strengths of teacher related to area of focus and connect to evidence.
  - Describe areas needing growth related to area of focus and connect to evidence.
  - Provide options for professional learning related to area in need of growth
- Teacher: Clarifying Questions
  - Teacher asks clarifying questions about evaluator reflection
- Evaluator:
  - Addresses teacher's questions through collaborative dialog

Observation Debrief: (15 minutes)
- Evaluator:
  - Reviews the domains of teacher practice observed
  - Reviews key and relevant evidence collected related to domains
  - Discusses rating for each domain observed and relates rating back to evidence and teacher practice rubric
  - Provides rating for each domain observed

Observation Summary: (10 minutes)
- Evaluator:
  - Provides orally and in writing three most critical items for feedback one of which must be an area for growth
  - Provides orally and in writing at least one option for professional learning related to area for growth
- Teacher:
  - Asks clarifying questions related to summary feedback
- Evaluator:
  - Addresses teacher's questions through collaborative dialog

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 17
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND GOALS EVALUATION FORM FOR
Initial Phase and Cycle YEAR A and B TEACHERS

Teacher Name: **Date:**

School: **Grade Level/Subject Area:**

Check the box that applies

☐ *Initial Phase*

☐ *Cycle year A Teacher*

☐ *Cycle year B Teacher*

Student Outcomes (50%)

Student Growth and Development (45%)

Student Learning Objective (SLO) (if applicable, should be aligned to standardized assessments):
What is the rationale for this SLO?
What are the Indicator(s) of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs) for this goal and how will the data be collected (if applicable, use standardized indicator)?   **IAGD #1:**   **IAGD #2:**
What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving the SLO? What is your time frame?
Reflection and Evidence:

Self-Assessment Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Whole School Student Learning and/or Student Feedback (5%)

Whole school learning Indicator and/ or Student Feedback:
What is the rationale for this goal?

What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving this goal? What is your time frame?			
Reflection and Evidence:			

Self-Assessment Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Teacher Practice (50%)

Parent Feedback (10%)

Parent Feedback Goal:			
What is the rationale for this goal?			
What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving the Parent Feedback Goal?			
Reflection and Evidence:			

Self-Assessment Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

Performance and Practice Goal (Provides focus for observation and feedback and covers domains 1-4):			
What is the rationale for this goal?			
What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving this goal? What is your time frame?			
Reflection and Evidence:			

Performance and	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Practice Goal Self-Assessment Rating:				
Performance and Practice Goal Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Summary Ratings

Student Outcomes Summative Ratings				
Growth and Development (SLO) Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Whole School Student Learning and/or Student Feedback Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Teacher Practice Summative Ratings				
Parent Feedback Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Domain 1 Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Domain 2 Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Domain 3 Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Domain 4 Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Overall Summative Ratings				
Student Outcomes Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Teacher Practice Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Overall Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Teacher's Signature: **Date:**

Evaluator's Signature: **Date:**

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT 17
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND GOALS EVALUATION FORM FOR
YEAR C TEACHERS

Teacher Name: **Date:**

School: **Grade Level/Subject Area:**

<u>**Student Outcomes (50%)**</u>

Student Growth and Development (45%)

Student Learning Objective (SLO) (if applicable, should be aligned to standardized assessments):
What is the rationale for this SLO?
What are the Indicator(s) of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs) for this goal and how will the data be collected (if applicable, use standardized indicator)? IAGD #1: IAGD #2:
What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving the SLO? What is your time frame?
Reflection and Evidence:

Self-Assessment Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Whole School Student Learning and/or Student Feedback (5%)

Whole school learning Indicator and/ or Student Feedback:
What is the rationale for this goal?
What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving this goal? What is your time frame?
Reflection and Evidence:

Self-Assessment Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Teacher Practice (50%)

Parent Feedback (10%)

Parent Feedback Goal:
What is the rationale for this goal?
What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving the Parent Feedback Goal?
Reflection and Evidence:

	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Self-Assessment Summative Rating:				
Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

What is your professional learning goal?
To utilize the structure of a professional book club to encourage reading and professional dialogue about educational issues relating to student engagement that will ultimately enhance classroom practice and thus student achievement.

What is the rationale for this Professional Learning Goal?
In the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014, Student engagement in both the planning and instruction domain are key indicators for student success. I have also utilized an engagement inventory in my class and have discovered that this is an area in which I have room to grow.

What is your action plan for your Professional Learning Goal?
1. **Form a group of professionals interested in the same focus for professional learning.**
2. **Commit to meeting once a month to discuss assigned readings and establish group norms. Group norms include participants taking turns hosting and leading discussions.**
3. **Various instructional strategies can be used to facilitate the process such as;** Jigsaw, Save the Last Word, etc.
4. **Submit a report outlining the timeline, assigned readings, and key discussion points/focus.**
5. Submit monthly reflections that may include individual affirmations, new learnings, and plans to apply discussed concepts to classroom practice including lesson plans and or student learning data.
6. Final reflection?

What data will you collect to assess progress toward achieving your Professional Learning Goal? What is your time frame?

Time frame: Monthly book club meetings from October to May. Classroom application and professional reading throughout the year.

Data:
Reflections, both individual and group reflections
Lesson Plans
Student data

Mid-year conference notes and adjustments:

End of Year Teacher Summative Refection and Evidence:

Self-Assessment	Does not meet Standard	Meets Standard

Summative Rating:		
Summative Rating:	Does not meet Standard	Meets Standard

Summary Ratings

Student Outcomes Summative Ratings				
Growth and Development (SLO) Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Whole School Student Learning and/or Student Feedback Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Teacher Practice Summative Ratings				
Parent Feedback Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Professional Learning Goal Summative Rating:	Does not meet Standard		d	
Overall Summative Ratings				
Student Outcomes Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Teacher Practice Summative Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Overall Rating:	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary

Teacher's Signature: **Date:**
Evaluator's Signature: **Date:**

RSD17 Teacher Assistance Plan

Teacher: **School:**

Teacher Assistance Plan Level □ Improvement Plan □ Remediation Plan	

Domain(s) and Indicator(s) to be addressed:

Specific teacher behavior that does not meet the standard:

Specific behavior / performance the teacher will exhibit that will show teacher now meets the standard :

Extenuating circumstances to consider :

Steps to reach the desired outcomes				
Action to be taken	**Resources needed**	**Evidence to be collected**	**Timeline for completing action**	**Responsibilities**
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.	5.	5.

Signatures of agreement to the plan:

Printed name - Teacher completing plan	Signature - Teacher completing plan	date

Printed name – HKEA Representative	Signature – HKEA Representative	date

Printed name - Evaluator of Teacher	Signature - Evaluator of Teacher	date

**(Signatures of those in attendance indicate agreement of the accuracy of what is written above.)

Others in attendance (if applicable):

Printed name	Signature	date

Printed name	Signature	date

Conference notes/changes to the plan:

date

End of Plan conference notes

date

Teacher status at end of plan period:

Teacher has completed the Assistance Plan, and the teacher's evaluation rating is now considered to be

_____.

Next steps :

Signatures of those in attendance:

_____   _____   _____
Printed name - Teacher completing plan   Signature - Teacher completing plan   date

_____   _____   _____
Printed name – HKEA Representative (if applicable)   Signature – HKEA Representative (if applicable)   date

_____   _____   _____
Printed name - Evaluator of Teacher   Signature - Evaluator of Teacher   date
**(Signatures of those in attendance indicate agreement of the accuracy of what is written above.)

Others (if applicable):

_____   _____   _____
Printed name   Signature   date

_____   _____   _____
Printed name   Signature   date

Additional information to consider when developing the plan:

1. **Deficiency to be addressed** - List the specific standard and component of the teaching framework used in the district, *including the wording* of same. Describe, in concrete terms, what the teacher specifically does that does not meet the district expectations. As appropriate, include the frequency of the behavior.

2. **Desired outcomes -** Give a concrete description of what the evaluator should see the teacher doing that will show that the teacher is now meeting the standard. As appropriate, include how frequently the teacher is expected to exhibit the behavior in order to be successful. When determining the desired outcomes, several factors should be considered, including but not limited to, the number of years of teaching experience the teacher has, the teacher's class/case load, other 'control factors' pertaining to the students, and resources the school has available to offer/provide the teacher.

3. **Action to be taken** - Actions may include things such as engaging in professional learning to learn new skills; meeting and working with a coach or peer; keeping a log or file of evidence that shows performance changes; etc. Actions may occur simultaneously and/or occur for a short or long period of time.

4. **Resources needed** - Resources might include things such as time for professional learning, materials and equipment, and access to people. If a teacher works with a peer or coach, the resources that person may need should also be listed.

5. **Evidence Collected** - For each action taken by the teacher or another person involved in the implementation of the Assistance Plan, there should be evidence collected that the action was taken, and when appropriate, what the impact of the action was. For example, if one action of the teacher is to implement a different teaching strategy, then some evidence of how that strategy affected the students may be appropriate to include.

6. **Timeline for completing action** - This should be carefully and realistically planned, taking into account the professional responsibilities the teacher has, the school calendar, and unplanned-for-issues that arise (e.g., a large number of snow days).

7. **Responsibilities** - For each action, this area should describe what the specific responsibilities are for each person involved in the action - the teacher, the evaluator, and/or any others working with the teacher.

RSD17 DISPUTE RESOLUTION FORM

Name of Teacher:
Name of Primary Evaluator:
School:
Date of Submission:
Reason for Appeal: (mutual goal setting, observation rating, goal rating, overall rating) Please be specific and include any and all supporting documentation.

Signature of Teacher:
Date Received by Superintendent's Office:

Dispute Resolution Panel:

Superintendent	Administrator 1	Administrator 2

HKEA Representative 1	HKEA Representative 2

Resolution of Conflict:

Appendix L: Adopted CSDE Revisions for SLO/IAGDs

Adapted from: CT State Board of Education-Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation May 7, 2014

45% SLO	=	22.5% IAGD(s) to accomplish the SLO	+	22.5% IAGD(s) to accomplish the SLO
The teacher's rating for meeting the Student Learning Objective is 45% of summative rating	=	-One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives (SLO) are met shall <u>not</u> be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, -but shall be determined through the <u>comparison of data</u> across assessments administered <u>over time.</u> *-No Standardized Indicator Available:* If a teacher does not have a standardized indicator (test, etc.) for the grade or subject, then the teacher <u>will select</u>, through mutual agreement, a <u>non-standardized indicator of growth</u>. *-Standardized Indicator Available:* If a teacher has a <u>state test</u> for the grade or subject *or* <u>another standardized indicator</u> for a grade or subject, then that test/indicator **will be used** to show growth, but <u>only if</u> there are interim assessments that lead to that test/indicator, <u>and</u> such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score. -**Except that**: a. For the 2014-15 academic year, the **required** use of **state** test data is suspended, pending federal approval, pursuant to PEAC's flexibility recommendation on January 29, 2014 and the State Board of Education's action on February 6, 2014. b. For 2015-16, PEAC will make adjustments to this system.		-One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives (SLO) are met shall <u>not</u> be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, -but shall be determined through the <u>comparison of data</u> across assessments administered <u>over time.</u> *-No Standardized Indicator Available:* If a teacher does not have a standardized indicator (test, etc.) for the grade or subject, then the teacher <u>will select</u>, through mutual agreement, a <u>non-standardized indicator of growth</u>. *-Standardized Indicator Available:* If a teacher has a second standardized indicator available, and if there is mutual agreement, the teacher **may** use this additional standardized indicator. This would yield the maximum (2) standardized indicators. **Or**, by mutual agreement, the teacher **may** choose a non-standardized indicator of growth.

**The RSD17 Evaluation Sub-committee would like to acknowledge the work of SEED (Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development), from which we have borrowed examples and wording. http://www.connecticutseed.org/?page_id=945